

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that in the Examiner's opinion the present application contains three inventions, namely:

A product defined in Claims 1-7 and constituting Group I,

A method of manufacturing defined in Claims 8-10 and constituting Group II,

Claims 1 and 12 drawn to an injection mold for manufacturing and constituting Group III.

The Examiner requested to elect a single invention for the further prosecution.

With the present Amendment applicant cancelled the original claims and submitted Claims 13-27, including Claims 13-19 defining a housing part in accordance with the present invention, Claims 20-24 defining a method for manufacturing a housing part in accordance with the present invention, and Claims 25-27 defining an injection mold for manufacturing a housing part in accordance with the present invention.

Responsive to the Examiner's election requirement, applicant elected without prejudice for further prosecution the invention dealing with a housing part. Claims 13-19 are readable on the elected invention.

At the same time, the Examiner's election requirement is respectfully traversed in connection with the claims submitted with the present Amendment.

Claim 13 defines a housing part for a drive unit with corresponding structural components, Claim 20, the broadest claim on file defines a method for manufacturing the housing part which includes the steps for producing the components of the housing part of Claim 1 substantially corresponding to these components so that the housing part defined in Claim 1 can be produced only by the method of Claim 20, and when the method of Claim 20 is realized only the housing part of Claim 1 can be produced.

Finally, Claim 25 defines an injection mold for manufacturing the housing part, which is configured so that it can produce only the housing part of Claim 1.

It is therefore believed that Claims 1, 20 and 25 have a common inventive idea and therefore, in accordance with Chapter 13 of PCT regulations, these claims have to be retained and further prosecuted jointly, together with the depending claims.

Consideration of the patent application and examination of all the claims currently on file is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233